

matter, and, probably, is softer than that of the Lake. This may be, and the water still be more objectionable for drinking and for culinary purposes. MR. KEEFER has very well discussed the influence upon consumers, of water taken from sources of doubtful purity, even though the mind might not be able to satisfy itself fully that the influence is, in reality, very material. Under the circumstances, it does not appear advisable to adopt the Bay as a source of supply. This conclusion is more readily reached from a conviction that some modifications will reduce considerably the excess of cost by the Lake plan. MR. KEEFER seems to have had very little time to examine the details of either plan of pumping, and will, no doubt, be able to improve those suggested, and reduce the cost even on the scale he has contemplated.

Before proceeding further, in regard to either plan, the question of quantity should be examined. It seems MR. KEEFER was instructed to provide for a population of 50,000. For this he estimated 50 imperial gallons per day for each inhabitant, as the average for the year; and a maximum for the warm summer season of about 75 gallons per day. Authorities may be quoted which sustain this estimate. But it is believed to be high for such a city as Hamilton. A seaport town consumes a large quantity of water in supplying vessels and steamboats, which would not be demanded in Hamilton.—Such towns as New York, Boston and Philadelphia, use large quantities of water in manufacturing establishments, and probably a much larger ratio than would be consumed in your city. A supply for domestic use and the extinguishment of fires, are the primary and indispensable objects. Next to these come the supply of manufactories, railway stations; watering sidewalks and

street
bath
foun
gard
W
easily
turni
alway
tanks
pean
porte
are o
consu
small
quire
any o
thoug
as yet
In larg
metres
pensat
metres
to be r
ficially
gained
of corr
rates c
doubt r
is by gr
the cit
fluence
obtaine
named.
With